



IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Inventors: Mary L. Mandich
William D. Reents

Case No.: 9-10

Serial No.: 09/912,129

Group Art Unit: 1731

Filing Date: July 24, 2001

Examiner: John M. Hoffman

Title: PROCESS FOR FABRICATING OPTICAL FIBER

THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20231

Dear Sir:

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.111, 1.112

This reply requests reconsideration from the Office Action mailed Dec. 12, 2003.

AMENDMENTS

None

REMARKS

Applicants request consideration of an information disclosure statement submitted concurrently.

Claims 1-10, 12-26, 28-39, 41-42, and 44 are pending.

Claims 1-10, 12-26, and 28-33 have been allowed.

Claims 34-39, 41-42, and 44 are rejected as being obvious.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Applicants incorporate herein arguments for the non-obviousness of independent claim 34 and dependent claims 35-39, 41-42, and 44 as already set forth in the response filed Nov. 4, 2002. Applicants summarize the following deficiencies in the present Office Action.

The Office Action does not provide a prior art suggestion that would have motivated modifying Bhandarkar's method or using Shintani's surface treating agents in Bhandarkar's method.